

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS PO Box 1450 Alcassedan, Virginia 22313-1450 www.emplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/560,707	12/15/2005	George Marmaropoulos	US030209US	6795	
24737 PHILIPS INTE	7590 12/29/201 ELLECTUAL PROPER	EXAM	EXAMINER		
P.O. BOX 3001			PIZIALI, ANDREW T		
BRIARCLIFF	MANOR, NY 10510	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
			1798	•	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			12/29/2010	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## **Advisory Action** Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

1	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/560,707	MARMAROPOULOS ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Andrew T. Piziali	1798	

	Andrew T. Piziali	1798					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the o	orrespondence add	ress				
THE REPLY FILED 21 December 2010 FAILS TO PLACE THIS	S APPLICATION IN CONDITION F	OR ALLOWANCE.					
<ol> <li>M The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:</li> </ol>	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavil eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, v with 37 CFR 41.31; or	vhich places the r (3) a Request				
The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing	date of the final rejection.						
b) It period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.							
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or ( MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION, See MPEP 706.07(	Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN T						
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.138(a). The date have been filled is the date for purposes of determining the period at under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patient term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL.	on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1: tension and the corresponding amount of shortened statutory period for reply origing than three months after the mailing dat	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Office	ate extension fee be action; or (2) as				
The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed w	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the					
AMENDMENTS	,						
<ol> <li>The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, to (a) They raise new issues that would require further con (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below).</li> </ol>	nsideration and/or search (see NOT		cause				
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or		ducing or simplifying t	he issues for				
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a		ected claims.					
NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.1							
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12		mpliant Amendment (	PTOL-324).				
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):							
<ol> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>							
7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a)   how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		l be entered and an e	xplanation of				
Claim(s) allowed:							
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 1-9 and 21-31.							
Claim(s) rejected. <u>1-9 and 21-31.</u> Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:							
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE							
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>							
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary</li> </ol>	vercome all rejections under appea	l and/or appellant fail	s to provide a				
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.				
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER  11.  The request for reconsideration has been consideration because:	ered but does NOT place the applic	ation in condition for	allowance				
See Continuation Sheet.							
12.  Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s).							
13. Other:							
	/Andrew T Piziali/						
	Primary Evaminar Art II	nit 1708					

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1798

## Continuation of 3. NOTE:

The plurality of proposed amendments to claim I raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search. For example, the proposed amendment to claim I such that a user interface comprises the conductive elastomeric material the actuator, raises new issues that would require further consideration and/or search. Another example is the proposed amendment to claim 1 such that the actuator is for translating the mechanical interaction while no longer necessarily for mechanically interacting with the at least one area of the conductive elastomeric material. Yet another example is the proposed amendment to claim 1 such that the actuator no longer necessarily includes a user interface having predefined markings.

In addition, the proposed amendment to claim 6, such that the actuator is formed from rigid material rather than formed from material more rigid than the conductive elastomeric material, raises new issues that would require further consideration and/or search.

Continuation of 11, does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

Due to the proposed amendments not being entered, applicant's arguments are not commensurate in scope with the current claims.